# Response to WillO’s response paper

(https://ia802500.us.archive.org/0/items/optimus_202205/optimus.pdf)

First of all, I’m highly thankful for WillO’s effort to help me understand this and for the time and effort he has put into it. Greatly appreciate it.

This entire paper argues using circular logic. It assumes something, and then goes on to prove using that assumption that things won’t work

## I

He says

*“and therfore predicts that T = 2.*
*However, the implication goes in only one direction. The standard theory predicts that T = 2, but the observation that T = 2 does not imply the standard theory.”*

This thing assumes $c_L$ and $c_R$ are independent of each other, we know

$$c_R = \frac{cc_L}{2c_L - c}$$

So, if we know the one way speed of light, the other way speed of light is fixed and it automatically implies the theory.

## II

He says in this section

*“$c_R = 1$ (taking the two-way speed of light to be 1);”*

This is the single most biggest mistake made in the paper, because he uses this as just 1 in other questions in instead of $c_R$ and draws weird conclusions.

Let’s just not substitute $c_R$ and see what happens.

**Now instead of $1 = 2/T$ we have $c_R = 2/T$** (3)

We have

$$c_R = \frac{vv_L}{2v_L + v(Tv_L - 2)} \tag{5}$$

Now here WillO says

*"and continuing to assume that T = 2 this becomes"*

$$c_R = \frac{v v_L}{v_L + v(v_L - 1)}$$

Now here is the crucial error, he is trying calculate $c_R$ assuming already $c_R = 1$ which was used by him in (3). This is circular substitution.

There was no need for the equation (4) and it's substitution as, if $v_L = v$, then $v_R = v_L = v$. The whole point of calculating the average and substituting is useless.

We already have from (1) that

$$T = 2/c_R + 1/v_L - 1/v_R$$

And if we apply $v_L = v_R$ then we can see clearly that $v_L$ and $v_R$ has no connection with c.
**The rest of paper is pure gibberish with no use.** The entire problem started creeping up because $c_R$ was assumed to be 1, and the same equation was used to calculated $c_R$.

This is like this

$$X = Y \qquad (1^*)$$
$$X - Y = 0 \qquad (2^*)$$

Now multiplying (1*) with (2*) we get

$$X(X - Y) = 0$$
$$X = 0$$

So we somehow arrived at X = 0, by doing some circular substitution

If we substitute $v = v_L = v_R$ in 5

We again get

$$c_R = 2/T$$

The entire section I and II just has one main equation which is (1) and runs in circles by simply substituting and assuming $c_R = 1$, and treating that 1 as though it is just another number while again calculating for $c_R$ in (6). This is just as the author of the paper calls it "this is an illusion"**.**